

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA , COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

Date: May 28, 1992
Honorable Ronald M. Sohigian, Judge
1

M. Cervantes, Deputy Clerk
None (E.R.M.)

BC 052395

(Parties and Counsel checked if present)

Church of Scientology, International
vs.

Counsel For
Plaintiff

Gerald Armstrong, et al.

Counsel For
Defendant

No Appearances

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: RULING ON MATTER TAKEN UNDER SUBMISSION ON MAY 27, 1992

In this matter heretofore taken under submission on May 27, 1992, the court now makes the following ruling.

1 Plaintiff's legal remedies are inadequate insofar as the scope of relief ordered below is concerned, but not otherwise. CCP 526(4) and (5).

2 The threatened acts which are restrained by the order referred to below, but only those threatened acts, would do irreparable harm to plaintiff which could not be compensated by monetary damages. CCP 526(2).

3 On the basis of the instant record, there is a reasonable probability that plaintiff will prevail after trial of this case in the respects restrained by this order. CCP 526(1); cf., San Francisco Newspaper Printing Co., Inc. vs. Superior Court (Miller) (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 438.

4 Plaintiff is likely to suffer greater injury from denial of the preliminary injunction the terms of which are set out below than the injury which defendant is likely to suffer if it is granted. See Robbins vs. Superior Court (County of Sacramento) (1985) 38 Cal. 3d 199, 206.

5 The granting of a preliminary injunction in the terms set out below will preserve the status quo pending trial.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA , COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

Date: May 28, 1992
 Honorable Ronald M. Sohigian, Judge
 1a

M. Cervantes, Deputy Clerk
 None (E.R.M.)

BC 052395

(Parties and Counsel checked if present)

Church of Scientology, International
 vs.

Counsel For
 Plaintiff

Gerald Armstrong, et al.

Counsel For
 Defendant

No Appearances

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: RULING ON MATTER TAKEN UNDER SUBMISSION ON MAY 27, 1992

6 Application for preliminary injunction is granted in part, in the following respects only.

Defendant Gerald Armstrong, his agents, and persons acting in concert or conspiracy with him (excluding attorneys at law who are not said defendant's agents or retained by him) are restrained and enjoined during the pendency of this suit pending further order of court from doing directly or indirectly any of the following:

Voluntarily assisting any person (not a governmental organ or entity) intending to make, intending to press, intending to arbitrate, or intending to litigate a claim against the persons referred to in sec. 1 of the "Mutual Release of All Claims and Settlement Agreement" of December, 1986 regarding such claim or regarding pressing, arbitrating, or litigating it.

Voluntarily assisting any person (not a governmental organ or entity) arbitrating or litigating a claim against the persons referred to in sec. 1 of the "Mutual Release of All Claims and Settlement Agreement" of December, 1986.

The court does not intend by the foregoing to prohibit defendant Armstrong from: (a) being reasonably available for the service of subpoenas on him; (b) accepting service of subpoenas on him without physical resistance, obstructive tactics, or flight; (c) testifying fully and fairly in response to properly put questions either in deposition, at trial, or in other legal or arbitration proceedings; (d) properly reporting or disclosing to authorities criminal conduct of the persons referred to in sec. 1 of the "Mutual Release of All Claims and Settlement Agreement" of December, 1986; or (e) engaging in gainful employment rendering clerical or paralegal services not contrary to the terms and conditions of this order.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA , COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

Date: May 28, 1992
 Honorable Ronald M. Sohigian, Judge
 1b

M. Cervantes, Deputy Clerk
 None (E.R.M.)

BC 052395

(Parties and Counsel checked if present)

Church of Scientology, International

Counsel For
Plaintiff

vs.

Gerald Armstrong, et al.

Counsel For
Defendant

No Appearances

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: RULING ON MATTER TAKEN UNDER SUBMISSION ON MAY 27, 1992

The application for preliminary injunction is otherwise denied.

7 The restraints referred to in sec. 6, above, will become effective upon plaintiff's posting an undertaking in the sum of \$70,000 pursuant to CCP 529(a) by 12:00 noon on June 5, 1992.

8 The restraints referred to in sec. 6, above, properly balance and accommodate the policies inherent in: (a) the protectable interests of the parties to this suit; (b) the protectable interests of the public at large; (c) the goal of attaining full and impartial justice through legitimate and properly informed civil and criminal judicial proceedings and arbitrations; (d) the gravity of interest involved in what the record demonstrates defendant might communicate in derogation of the contractual language; and (e) the reasonable interpretation of the "Mutual Release of All Claims and Settlement Agreement" of December, 1986. The fair interpretation of all the cases cited by the parties indicates that this is the correct decisional process. The law appropriately favors settlement agreements. Obviously, one limitation on freedom of contract is "public policy"; in determining what the scope of the public policy limitation on the parties' rights to enforcement of their agreement in the specific factual context of this case, the court has weighed the factors referred to in the first sentence of this section. Litigants have a substantial range of contractual freedom, even to the extent of agreeing not to assert or exercise rights which they might otherwise have. The instant record shows that plaintiff was substantially compensated as an aspect of the agreement, and does not persuasively support defendant's claim of duress or that the issues involved in this preliminary injunction proceeding were precluded by any prior decision.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA , COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

Date: May 28, 1992
Honorable Ronald M. Sohigian, Judge
1c

M. Cervantes, Deputy Clerk
None (E.R.M.)

BC 052395

(Parties and Counsel checked if present)

Church of Scientology, International

Counsel For
Plaintiff

vs.

Gerald Armstrong, et al.

Counsel For
Defendant

No Appearances

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: RULING ON MATTER TAKEN UNDER SUBMISSION ON MAY 27, 1992

9 The court does not dispositively decide the underlying merits of the case except for this preliminary determination. CCP 526(1); Baypoint Mortgage Corp. vs. Crest Premium Real Estate etc. Trust (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 818, 823.

10 Plaintiff is ordered give written notice by mail by June 5, 1992, including in that written notice a statement regarding whether plaintiff has or has not posted the undertaking referred to in sec. 7, above, and attaching to that written notice evidence showing that the undertaking has been posted if that is the fact.

DATED: May 28, 1992.

RONALD M. SOHIGIAN

RONALD M. SOHIGIAN
Judge of the Superior Court

A copy of this minute order is sent to counsel via United States mail this date.